


Express Mail® Mailing Label Number:  
Date of Deposit:

EV 494960623 US

7-21-05

I hereby certify that this paper, and all documents indicated therein as being attached are being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Mail Stop Issue Fee, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

*Elaine M. Checovich*  
Elaine M. Checovich



**PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

INVENTOR(S) : Salil Prabhakar, et al.

TITLE : PICTURE/GRAPHICS CLASSIFICATION  
SYSTEM AND METHOD

APPLICATION NO. : 09/965,922

FILED : September 28, 2001

CONFIRMATION NO. : 4213

EXAMINER : S. Ishrat

ART UNIT : 2621

ALLOWED : July 15, 2005

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. : A1095-US-NP  
XERZ 2 00435

**RESPONSE TO STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
**Mail Stop Issue Fee**

Dear Sir:

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication as to the allowance of the present application.

However, applicants respectfully submit the Statements of Reasons for Allowance are, in and of themselves, inappropriate. It is noted that the reasons for allowance may be set forth in instances in which " . . . the Examiner believes that the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear his or her reasons for allowing a claim or claims." (37 CFR §1.104(e)(2004)). In the present case, applicants believe the record as a whole does make the reasons for allowance clear and, therefore, no statement

by the Examiner is necessary or warranted. Furthermore, the applicants do not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance.

Specifically, it has been indicated that the claims are allowed by importing interpretations into the claims in relation to the prior art that results in a potential imprecise and/or inaccurate understanding of the reasons. This places an unwarranted interpretation upon the claims. Such a characterization of the claims does not properly take into account applicants' claimed invention as reflected in the specification and the applicants' responses to the Examiner's office actions.

Therefore, while applicants believe the claims are allowable, applicants do not acquiesce that patentability resides in only the features, exactly as expressed in the claims, nor that each feature is required for patentability.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,  
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

7/21/05  
Date

  
John S. Zanghi, Esq.  
Reg. No. 48,843  
1100 Superior Avenue, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579  
(216) 861-5582